
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3260121

35 Paget Rise, Plumstead SE18 3QQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Biljana Glusica and Mr Edward Bailey against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 20/1094/HD, dated 14 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is Construction of an L-shaped loft conversion with rear dormers and roof lights to the front plane of the roof including reinstatement of the decorative pitched roof above the front bay window.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 26th January 2021

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for the construction of an L-shaped loft conversion with rear dormers and roof lights to the front plane of the roof including reinstatement of the decorative pitched roof above the front bay window at 35 Paget Rise, Plumstead SE18 3QQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/1094/HD, dated 14 April 2020 and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. I noted on my site visit that there is a rear dormer in place to the rear roof slopes of the host property. This appeared to broadly accord with the submitted plans. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans for the avoidance of doubt.
3. I was also able to observe that the roof lights to the front plane of the roof had been installed and the decorative pitched roof above the front bay window had been reinstated. These elements also appeared to be broadly in accordance with the submitted plans. There does not appear to be any disagreement between the parties in relation to this aspect of the scheme.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the rear dormer roof extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a terraced dwelling which sits on the sloping Paget Rise. The views of the rear of the property are most prominent from the elevated Cantwell Road, which runs diagonally to the south east.
6. The dormer window is large and spans in two sections across the majority of the main rear roof slope and a large part of the roof of the two-storey outrigger. It could not be considered as a small-scale dormer extension which is suggested within the SPD¹ and the proposal fails to accord with this guidance.
7. However, when viewed from Cantwell Road, the rear dormer roof extension has a reasonably subtle appearance, its dark cladding meaning that it does not stand out against the falling roof slopes on the terrace, the majority of which have dark finishes.
8. Further, I noted the presence of a large box dormer to the rear of a dwelling further up the terrace, which was more prominent than the appeal site when viewed from Cantwell Road. While I appreciate that there are other properties within the terrace that appear to have unaltered rear roof slopes, the presence of this dormer means that they already form part of the character of the area.
9. Whilst the broader form of the windows is not especially reflective of the proportions of those on the host dwelling, the larger openings are broken down by their framing into slimmer panels which retain a vertical emphasis, reflective of the host dwelling. In any event, the rear windows are partially shielded by the parapet wall on the outrigger when viewed from Cantwell Road. I do not therefore find conflict with the SPD in this respect.
10. In conclusion, despite breaching the guidance within the SPD, the proposal would have no unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area. I do not therefore find conflict with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014) (RGLP) nor Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which amongst other things require development proposals which are appropriate to local character. I have identified no conflict with Policy DH(b) of the RGLP which seeks to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed. The three conditions suggested by the Council would not be appropriate given the appeal development appears to be completed.

TJ Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance December 2018.